

Shakespeariana

No. LXVI.

JUNE, 1889.

VOL. VI.

DID BEN JONSON WRITE BACON'S WORKS?

II.

(Continued from April Number.)

HE learned men who associated with Jonson and talked with Bacon could not fail to suspect what Jonson was doing in Bacon's study; and when any of these gentlemen witnessed a performance of one of Jonson's plays, and heard the warnings, in address or prologue, not to decipher the cipher, they appreciated the joke, and looked out for interesting revelations, for Jonson was continually warning his audiences not to believe there were any intentional allusions to any prominent personage, and, at the same time, was constantly making allusions which could scarcely be mistaken; precisely as Bacon wrote to Queen Elizabeth not to believe that he desired his friends to press his claims upon her attention, and, at the same time was urging those friends to redouble their exertions. (*Letters and Life*, I., 254-5-8.)

In *The Silent Woman* we shall find the references to Bacon repeated, while, in a later prologue to this play, Jonson repeats the warning, evidently "by request," that no one will be wicked enough to misinterpret them. Bacon appears in this play under the name of Sir John Daw, and Jonson here says of Daw what Queen Elizabeth said of Sir Francis Bacon; what Lord Burleigh said of him; what Sir Edward Coke said of him—that he was showy "but not deep."

"The world reports him to be very learned," says Clerimont. To which Truewit replies: "I am sorry the world should so conspire to belie him." "I have heard very good things come from him," persists Clerimont. "You may," responds Truewit, "there's none so desperately ignorant as to deny that; would they were his own."

The reader will remember that the Earl of Southampton was tried as an accomplice in Essex' insurrection; that the Earl of

Essex was beheaded, and that the Earl of Southampton was committed close prisoner to the Tower; and that Bacon, anxious to win the Queen's favor, betrayed every confidence in order to insure the conviction of his noble benefactor. After the death of Queen Elizabeth, one of the first acts of King James was to release Southampton from the Tower. Then a letter was written to the Earl by Bacon, a letter which thoroughly reveals his whole character. He says: "This great change hath wrought in me no other change towards your lordship than this, that I may safely be now that which I was truly before." (*L. and L.*, III., 75-76.)

Now, in the play, we seem to perceive an allusion to this circumstance in the concluding words of a message sent to Sir John Daw,

"She will'd me in private to tell you, that she shall be able to do you more favors, and with more security now than before." (III., 1.)

It will also be remembered that Bacon was made Queen's Counsel Extraordinary by Elizabeth, and that Lord Campbell, in his *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, assures us that this was the first appointment of the kind. Clerimont says of Sir John Daw :

"I wonder he is not called to the helm, and made a counsellor."

To which Dauphine answers :

"He is one extraordinary." (II., 111.)

If we suspect a person of obtaining fame under false pretences, of assuming to be a philosopher, any independent statement of his upon a philosophical subject will tend to allay or confirm our impressions; and thus, if we could learn, aside from the works which Bacon is alleged to have written, what his independent statement was upon a question of this character, it would, at least, afford us satisfaction. Now it fortunately happens that we have a report from a trustworthy source, giving the substance of what Bacon once said to Prince Henry, the eldest son of James I.:

"His lordship presented to Prince Henry two triangular stones (as the first fruits of his philosophy) to imitate the sym-

pathetical motion of the loadstone and iron, although made up by the compounds of meteors (as star-shot jelly) and other like magical ingredients, with the reflected beams of the sun, on purpose that the warmth distilled into them from the moist heat of the hands might discover an affection of the heart by a visible sign of their attraction and appetite to each other, like the hands of a watch within ten minutes after they are laid on a marble table, or the theatre of a great looking-glass. I write not this as a feigned story, says Mr. Bushel (Extract, pp. 17-18), but as a real truth, for I was never quiet in my mind till I did procure these jewels of my lord's philosophy from my friend Mr. Archy Primrose, the Prince's page." (*Gen. Dict.*, Fol. II., 571, note.)

Is not that the language of a mountebank? Does it not look like an attempt to impose upon a young prince? If it were not published on such excellent authority, we might safely discredit the story; but, since no one has sounded the depths of philosophy, this may, after all, be an excellent illustration of Bacon's exceeding wisdom. These triangular stones may have been picked up by this "pioneer" out of "the mine of truth which lay so deep," though to an unphilosophical layman the whole business smacks of the harlequin.

Very soon after the publication of the *Novum Organum*, Bacon furnished the most conspicuous example of official corruption that has ever disgraced the history of England. This was in April, 1621. He wasted no time in regret, but at once took measures for the translation of his alleged works, and, together with some legal treatises and several historical works which were projected but never completed, wrote his (1) *Theological Tracts*; (2) *History of Henry VII.*; (3) *Paraphrase of the Psalms*; (4) The Miscellaneous papers which were published in quarto after his death.

No one now would care to read these *Theological Tracts*. The best of theological tracts are hard reading, and Bacon's are among the worst. Archbishop Tenison mildly says of them: "There appears nothing so extraordinary in their composition as is found in his lordship's other labors." (*Gen. Dict.*, II., 569, note.)

The History of Henry VII. In reading this history one is

reminded of the story, which Macaulay relates somewhere, of a notorious Italian criminal, who was proffered a choice of punishment ; either to read Guicciardini's History or be chained to an oar in the galleys. The criminal chose the history, but shortly repented, and cheerfully went to the galleys.

" Of all his works, this " (*Henry VII.*), says Lord Campbell, " gave the least satisfaction to the public ; and after recently again perusing it, I must confess that it is hardly equal to Sir Thomas More's *History of Richard III.*, or to Camden's of Queen Elizabeth, leaving the reproach upon our literature of being lamentably deficient in historical composition till the days of Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon. Some have accounted for Bacon's failure by supposing a decline in his faculties, but he afterwards showed that they remained in their pristine vigor to the very close of his career." (Campbell, *Lord Chancellors*, III., pp. 100, 101.)

" It would be endless," says Budgell, in the *Guardian*, No. 25, " should I point out the frequent tautologies and circumlocutions that occur on every page. . . . It was, in all probability, his application to the law that gave him a habit of being so wordy ; of which I shall put down two or three examples : (1) ' That all records, wherein there was any memory or mention of the king's attainder, should be defaced, cancelled, and taken off the file.' . . . (2) ' Taxing him for a great taxer of his people, not by proclamations, but by court-fames, which commonly print better than printed proclamations.' . . . (3) ' It was observed, that the great tempest which drove Philip into England, blew down the Golden Eagle from the spire of St. Paul's ; and in the fall it fell upon a sign of the Black Eagle, which was in St. Paul's churchyard, in the place where the school-house now standeth, and battered it, and broke it down ; which was a strange stooping of a hawk upon a fowl.' "

Voltaire has recorded his amazement at such a performance as Bacon's *Henry VII.*, and says he wonders how any one can presume to compare so little a work with that of the illustrious De Thou. He then quotes a passage wherein Lord Bacon

speaks of the impostor Perkin Warbeck, who assumed the name and title of Richard IV., King of England, at the instigation of the Duchess of Burgundy ; and who disputed the crown with Henry VII. Upon which “the brilliant Frenchman” remarks that the sagacious De Thou does not give in to such fustian, which formerly was looked upon as sublime, but in the present age is justly called nonsense. (*Gen. Dic.*, Fol. II., 568, note. Voltaire, Paris, 1843, *Lettres sur les Anglais*, Lettre XII., Liv. V., p. 18.)

The Paraphrase of the Psalms. Archbishop Tenison observes : “It is very seldom that he [Lord Bacon] courted the muses ; and, therefore, his vein does not appear so elegant and happy as exercise might have made it. The truth is, it is one of the hardest things in the world to excel in poetry ; and to attempt and not to excel, is to lose both time and reputation.” (*Gen. Dic.*, Fol. II., 569, note.) “He wrote some religious tracts,” says Lord Campbell, “and he employed himself in a metrical translation into English of some of the Psalms of David—showing by this effort, it must be confessed, more piety than poetry. His ear had not been formed, nor his fancy fed, by a perusal of the divine productions of Surrey, Wyat, Spenser, and Shakespeare, or he could not have produced rhymes so rugged, and turns of expression so mean.” (*Lord Chan.*, III., p. 110.)

“ So shall he not lift up his head
In the assembly of the just.
For why ? The Lord hath special eye
To be the godly's stay at call ;
And hath given over righteously
The wicked man to take his fall.”—Bacon.

After this we need not be surprised to learn that the *Remains*, which were published in quarto, “do not come up to the spirit and penetration of that noble author.” What ! The author of the *Essays* write such theological tracts ! The author of the *Advancement and Proficiency of Learning* write such a history ! The author of the *Novum Organum* write such poetry ! And that is not all. It was bad enough to

write them ; but to print them was worse. To publish these things under the name, however unworthy, that was sanctified by its connection with *The Great Instauration*, showed that Bacon was deficient in judgment, and, therefore, could not have written the *Essays*. Showed that he was ignorant, and could not have written *The Advancement and Proficiency of Learning*. Proved that he was destitute of the poetic faculty, and could not have written the *Norum Organum* !

Bacon the author of *Philosophical Works* which have made his fame ? No, most assuredly, no ! Bacon the author, with Jonson silent at his elbow ? No, the true author was Jonson, Jonson, "the brother of Shakespeare" !

Not less significant is the use which Bacon and Jonson severally made of their time. "The delicacy of Bacon's constitution, his frequent illnesses, and the time absorbed by official and professional duties," constitute an argument against the probability of his having written the philosophical works with which he has been credited ; while a careful examination will prove that Jonson was neglectful of the stage at the identical periods when we should expect him to be engaged in the production of the works which have been called Bacon's. This accounts for his being termed "slow," to which there is reference by Jonson himself in nearly every one of his earlier plays :

" Yes ; they say you are slow,
And scarce bring forth a play a year.
Author. 'Tis true.
I would they could not say that I did that !
There's all the joy that I take in their trade."

Jonson, however, convinced the most incredulous that the stupid charge was utterly unfounded by writing, as we have seen, *The Fox* in five weeks. What was he doing with the rest of his time ? That he was writing for some one else is proved by his own statement in the dedication of this play : " My works are read, allowed. I speak of those which are entirely mine."

Gifford wonders what Jonson was doing about 1615-16

(*Memoirs of Jonson*, p. 30), the very time, we now know, that the *Novum Organum* was being prosecuted vigorously. We know, too, that Bacon had some leisure at this same time, and we ought to inquire what use he made of it. The natural answer would seem to be that, without a moment's loss of time, he went to work upon the great object of his ambition, upon which, he has told us, he labored for more than thirty years. He did nothing of the kind; but in his letter of thanks to the King for having appointed him of the Privy Council, says: "And after I had thought of many things, I could find in my judgment none more proper for your Majesty as a master, nor for me as a work, than *the reducing and recompiling of the laws of England!*" (Campbell, *Lord Chan.*, III., 46. *Letters and L.*, VI., 62.) Again, we know that the last ten years of Bacon's life was the period during which most of the philosophical works were written; that is, from 1616 to and including 1625. It, therefore, becomes a matter of some interest to ask what Jonson was doing during this long and busy time; and it should not surprise us to learn that "a long series of years had now elapsed since our author turned his thoughts to the theatre. From 1616 to 1625 he appears to have forgotten that there was such a place." (Gifford, *Mem.*, p. 44.) It must be admitted that this concurrence of coincidences is, at least, very strange; that it amply confirms the supposition of Gifford, that "we have not all that Jonson wrote," or if all that he wrote has been published, a large part of it was published under another man's name. In the *De Augmentis* (lib. II., cap. 13) there is a discourse on poetry, which was declared by Addison (*Tatler*, 108) to be the best which, up to that time, had been written. Who wrote it? What Bacon could do in the way of poetry we have seen; and what his judgment in poetry was is painful to think upon; yet we are asked to believe that Bacon, who wrote the *Paraphrase of the Psalms*, wrote this unapproachable article on poetry in the *De Augmentis*! A man can no more write an admirable article upon poetry and be ignorant of its principles, than he can write an instructive treatise upon the formation of the earth and be unacquainted with

geology. "To judge of poets," says Jonson, "is only the faculty of poets; and not of all poets, but the best." (*Disc.*)

When we know that Bacon failed in literature almost as miserably at sixty-five as he had failed at twenty-five, and are assured that his genius grew stronger as he advanced in years, what can we think of it? We are told that at sixty-five his intellect was in its zenith; how then can we account for the *Theological Tracts* and the *Paraphrase of the Psalms*? These were written when Bacon was in his sixty-fifth year, and they are, unquestionably, among the worst things ever published. They were written towards the close of the year 1625; and here, again, is a striking coincidence: Jonson was stricken with palsy towards the close of the year 1625 (Gifford, *Mem.*); had he been so inclined, his advice should have prevented the publication of the *Paraphrase*; although it would be very natural that he should be willing these things should be printed, that the world might perceive the monstrous incongruity, and be as convinced, as so many of his contemporaries seem to have been, that he, Jonson, was the author of *The Great Instauration*. To destroy this hope was Bacon's and Toby Matthew's work. They systematically effaced or disguised every tittle of evidence which the letters and the papers of Bacon might otherwise have furnished. We have seen what they did in one instance with Jonson's name. Let Bacon's latest editor tell the rest:

"Sir Toby Matthew's collection," says Mr. Spedding, "I do not hold very high as authorities for the exact text; for I suspect that he used the privilege of an editor rather freely in omitting or disguising personal allusions and occasionally mending the style by the alteration of a word or two." (*L. and L.*, III., 62.) Again, "I conceive, therefore, that (the evidence of Bacon's own handwriting notwithstanding) the date here assigned to it must be accepted as unquestionably correct." (IV., 116.) Again, "Like most of the letters in this collection, has been stripped of dates and names and such circumstances as might serve to identify the particular occasion." (VII., 200.) Again, "As to the particular dates of each, there is scarcely enough to hang a conjecture on. Toby Matthew, as I have already had occasion to observe, appears to have purposely obliterated or disguised names and particulars." (IV., 132.)

When we realize that the acts of Bacon's life were diametrically opposed to the principles of his alleged philosophy ; when we remember that he was constantly forgetting the contents of the writings with which, if they had been his, he should have been perfectly familiar, so that he docketed them incorrectly, and put impossible dates upon them ; when we learn that he and his particular friend went deliberately to work to disguise names and particulars which might serve to identify occasions and men—what shall we say of it ? Must we not conclude that if it had been his philosophy, it could not have been so useless to him ? That, if they were his writings, he could not have been so ignorant of them ? That, if he had been the true author of the *Philosophical Works*, there could have been nothing to conceal ?

Nor was Jonson the only sufferer, nor are the Philosophical fragments, the *Essays*, the *Advancement of Learning*, and *The Great Instauration* the only works which have long been falsely called Bacon's, and which have contributed to swell his ill-got fame. *Notes on the Present State of Christendom* is a work "which has always passed for Bacon's," but of which Mr. Spedding, the editor of Bacon's *Letters and Life*, says : "I am not satisfied with the evidence or authority upon which it appears to have been ascribed to him." (*L. and L.*, I., 16.) The *Advice to Villiers* is not Bacon's. The paper conveys the impression that it was written after the death of the Queen (March, 1619), when its proper date must have been 1616. (*L. and L.*, VI., 54, note.) It is docketed as addressed to the Duke of Buckingham ; but in the letter itself the person to whom it was originally addressed is spoken of as "Sir," with respect to which the editor says : "Now I think it would be hard to find another case in which a nobleman not of royal blood was intentionally called 'Sir.'" (*VI.*, 12.)

"Let vanity in apparel, and which is more vain, that of the fashion, be avoided. I have heard that in Spain (a grave nation whom in this I wish we might imitate) they do allow the players and courtesans the vanity of the rich and costly cloaths, but to sober men and matrons they permit it not, upon pain and in-

famy (a severer punishment upon ingenious natures than a pecuniary mulct)." (1st version, VI., 23.) Clearly this could not have been written by the man of whom Carleton writes to Chamberlain on May 11, 1606, "Sir Francis Bacon was married yesterday to his young wench in Maribone Chapel. *He was clad from top to toe in purple, and hath made himself and his wife such store of fine raiments of cloth of silver and gold, that it draws deep into her portion.*" Of *A Brief Discourse touching the Low Countries, the King of Spain, the King of Scots, the French King, and Queen Elizabeth, with some remarkable passages of State*, a work which has always been claimed for Bacon, Mr. Spedding says, "Upon a careful examination I am convinced that it was not written by Bacon." (*L. and L.*, I., 67.) The *Advice to Coke*, which appeared among Bacon's works as early as 1648, and which is quoted as Bacon's by Lord Campbell in his *Lives of the Lord Chancellors* (III., 49), is not Bacon's. (*L. and L.*, VI., 123 et seq.) All editions of Bacon contain a theological piece entitled *The characters of a believing Christian in paradoxes and seeming contradictions*, commonly spoken of as *Christian Paradoxes*, which is not Bacon's. "In 1864 the Rev. Alexander Grosart, to whom we owe so many valuable reprints, had the good fortune to make all further doubt and discussion superfluous by producing the real author. The work in question forms a portion of the second part of Herbert Palmer's *Memorials of Godliness and Christianity*." (*L. and L.*, VI., 130.) *An Historical Account of the Alienation Office*. The late Lord Chancellor Campbell, referring to the fact that Coke "continued to take every opportunity to disgrace and disable Bacon's law and his experience and discretion as an advocate," says: "Yet this year (1599) Bacon gave proofs of professional learning and skill which ought forever to have saved him from such taunts. He wrote *The History of the Alienation Office*, a treatise worthy of Hale, showing a most copious and accurate acquaintance with existing law and our legal antiquities." Now this treatise, for which Lord Campbell praises Bacon so highly, is not Bacon's in any sense whatever. By the chance discovery

of the original manuscript in the library of Cambridge University, *The History of the Alienation Office* was proved to be the work of William Lambarde. (*L. and L.*, II., 121.) Thus there is good reason to believe that the *Political Tracts* and *Legal Treatises* are not the product of Bacon's mind, but the work of men whose names have been suppressed, and whose credit has been checked by this insatiable remora. Is it not high time that a careful examination should be made of the remaining legal treatises and political discourses, to ascertain, if that is now possible, who were their true authors? We have a right to demand that Bacon shall no longer, unquestioned, usurp the fame of better men. That a critical and exhaustive investigation would yield astonishing results there can be no doubt, since within a few years mere accidents have furnished proof that works which have long been spoken of with the highest praise as Bacon's are undoubtedly the writings of other men. How these various works came into Bacon's possession, and why they have been called his for two centuries and a half, is, in view of what has here been said, a very interesting question.

Jonson visited Scotland in the year 1619. Soon after his return he wrote a Masque entitled *News from the New World discovered in the Moon*, which was presented at court in the year 1620. There are excellent reasons for believing that the King had by this time suspected that Jonson was the true author of the *Philosophical Works*. With this in mind, we can readily imagine, from the following extract, the intense degree of amusement with which James I. listened to the *News from the New World discovered in the Moon*:

Print. How might we do to see your poet? Did he undertake this journey, I pray you, to the moon on foot?

1 Her. Why do you ask?

Print. Because one of our greatest poets (I know not how good a one) went to Edinburgh on foot, and came back; marry he has been restive, they say, ever since; for we have had nothing from him; he has set out nothing, I am sure.

1 Her. Like enough, perhaps he has not all in; when he has all in, he will set out, I warrant you, at least those from whom he had it; it is the very same party that has been in the moon now.

Print. Indeed! has he been there since? belike he rid thither then?

Fact. Yes, post, upon the poet's horse for a wager.

Now the poet who went to Edinburgh was Ben Jonson, who returned after a short visit in 1619. "He has not all in." The *Novum Organum*, or *Second Part of the Instauratio Magna*, was not yet completed. "When he has all in, he will set out, I warrant you." It was published several months afterwards, October, 1620. "It is the very same party that has been in the moon now." The "party" who had been in the moon, and upon the poet's horse, was Bacon. But why should Bacon have been thought to go to the moon at all? Because Bacon always fainted at an eclipse of the moon; and his intimate friends and servants, naturally enough, supposed that his spirit had gone there during the time of the eclipse. This strange weakness is testified to on the very best authority, namely, that of Bacon's own chaplain and biographer, the Rev. Dr. Rawley. (Rawley's *Life of Lord Bacon*. *Gen. Dic.*, Fol. II., 570.)

When Jonson paid the visit to Scotland, just referred to, he remained for a few days with Drummond of Hawthornden. In the record of the *Conversations* there, which was carefully preserved by Drummond, we find the following:

"A play of his upon which he was accused (is called) *The Devil is an Ass*. According to *Comedia Vetus* in England, the Devil was brought in either with one Vice or other: the play done, the Devil carried away the Vice. (But) he brings in the Devil so overcome with the wickedness of the age that he thought himself ane Ass. *Παρεργούς* (?) *Παρεργός* is discoursed of the Duke of Drounland (?) The King desired him to conceal it. (Accordingly, though the play was acted in 1616, it was not printed till long afterwards.)"

The comedy, *The Devil is an Ass*, turns upon a project for the recovery of the Drown'd lands, or the Fens of Norfolk and Lincolnshire. Jonson told Drummond that *Παρεργός* was discoursed of the Duke of Drown'd lands, and the King expressly desired Jonson to conceal that fact. Now it is certain that the project for the recovery of Drown'd lands, had been buzzing in Bacon's ears for a long time prior to the date of this comedy; repeated mention of it is found in the *Letters and Life*. Thus,

as early as 1608, among Bacon's private memoranda, first published by Mr. Spedding (Vol. IV.) under the heading of *Services on Foot*, appears the significant entry : " *Title of Drown'd Lands*," and that he had not lost sight of the project, even so late as the year 1619-20, is shown most conclusively by a letter to the King, and one of the last which Bacon addressed to him previous to his own fall from power, in which Bacon says :

" . . . and because your Majesty in that you have already done hath so well affected that which I foresaw and desired, even beyond my expectation, it is no marvel if I resort still to the branches of that counsel that hath borne so good fruit.

. . . There wants a fourth part of the square to make all complete, which is, if your Majesty will be pleased to publish certain Commonwealth Commissions."

And among these Commissions, we perceive again " *Commission for the Recovery of Drown'd Lands*." (L. and L., VII., 70, 71.) As Jonson said in the comedy :

" The thing is for recovery of drown'd land,
Whereof the crown's to have a moiety,
If it be owner ; else the crown and owners
To share the moiety, and the recoverers
To enjoy the t'other moiety for their charge." (II., 1.)

Fabian Fitzdottrell, who, in the play, seeks to recover the Drown'd lands, and is said to be a frequent lounger among the elms of Lincoln's Inn (Act I., sc. 3), decides that his title shall be Duke of Drown'd-land.

Meer. . . . take
Your title thence, sir, *Duke of the Drown'd Lands*,
Or, *Drown'd-land*.

Fitz. Ha ! that last has a good sound :
I like it well. The Duke of Drown'd-land ?

The King, Jonson told Drummond, desired him to conceal this. It would seem to follow, therefore, that the King suspected that Jonson was the real author of the works which had appeared under Bacon's name. Whether Jonson volunteered this information, or upon a promise of secrecy confided the knowledge to the King, we cannot know ; it is quite sufficient

for us to know that *παρεπύος*, the useless appendage, Bacon, was signified by the Duke of Drown'd-land, and that the King wished it concealed. Carefully remembering this, the subsequent actions of the King and Buckingham, the peculiar tone of their letters to Bacon, and their unwillingness to assist him in any literary scheme, are all satisfactorily accounted for. Thus when Bacon wrote to the King, and with the letter sent him a copy of the *Novum Organum*, the earnestness of the desire to make the King believe that he, Bacon, was the author, was in itself enough to excite suspicion, for such language would not have been penned by Bacon, if Bacon had not thought it necessary. He says: "There be two of your council, and one other bishop of this land, that know I have been about some such work near thirty years; so as I made no haste." (*L., and L.*, VII., 120.) And that there was doubt in the royal mind upon this subject is confirmed, not only by what we have seen Jonson imparted to Drummond, but from a letter which Buckingham subsequently wrote to Bacon upon receiving a copy of the *De Augmentis*, which Bacon had requested him to deliver to the King. Buckingham says:

MY HONORABLE LORD: I have delivered your lordship's letter and your book to his Majesty, who hath promised to read it over: I wish I could promise as much for that which you sent me, that my understanding of that language might make me capable of those good fruits *which I assure myself by an implicit faith proceed from your pen*. But I will tell you in good English, with my thanks for your book, that I ever rest

Your lordship's faithful friend and servant,

G. BUCKINGHAM." (*L. and L.*, VII., 438.)

It is not probable that Buckingham would have told Bacon that he had *assured* himself by an *implicit faith* that those good fruits proceeded from Bacon's pen, unless there had been some doubt expressed upon the subject to Buckingham. It is, however, very probable that, shortly afterwards, Buckingham was convinced that Bacon was not the author, for this letter is one of the very last of the friendly communications which he addressed to him. He seems to have listened as unconcernedly as did his royal master to the appeals which Bacon subsequent-

ly made for pecuniary assistance to enable him to gather "those good fruits;" and it may not unreasonably be supposed that the King had, in the meantime, revealed to his favorite Buckingham that Jonson was the true author of the *Philosophical Works*, and that Bacon was merely a *Παρεπόνος* or useless appendage. At all events, it is certain that Jonson was in great favor at Court at the very time when it disdained the pitiful appeals of Bacon.

If these suspicions were seriously entertained by the King prior to Bacon's fall, that event, and the pardon for which he afterwards prayed, must have confirmed them in a most painful way. It may be worth while to recall the circumstances briefly :

In the year 1621 Bacon, then Lord Chancellor, was accused of bribery, twenty-eight charges being distinctly specified. He confessed his guilt, and was sentenced—(1) To a fine and ransom of £40,000. (2) Imprisonment during the King's pleasure in the Tower. (3) Incapable of any office, place, or employment in the State or Commonwealth. (4) Never to sit in Parliament, nor to come within the verge of the court.

Put to the question, whether these punishments above shall be inflicted upon the L. Viscount St. Alban or no? AGREED, *Dissentiente, L. Admiral.* This was the whole judicial proceeding. It remained only to pronounce sentence, which was done with due ceremony, as described in the journals. This took place upon May 3, 1621. Upon May 12 Bacon had not gone to the Tower, whereupon the Earl of Southampton, the companion of Essex and the noble friend to whom Shakespeare dedicated the *Venus and Adonis* and the *Rape of Lucrece*, became impatient at the delay, and called the attention of the House of Lords to the fact: "Southampton. That the Lord Chancellor is not yet gone to the Tower; moved, that the world may not think our sentence is in vain." (*L. and L.*, VII., pp. 269, 270, 279.) Bacon was then sent to the Tower, but his stay there was very brief. He was continually writing in an unmanly strain to the King and Buckingham for pity and pardon, though at the same time he confessed the justice of his

sentence. His persistency at length obtained its reward; and in October, 1621, through the good offices of Buckingham, the King was persuaded to pardon the ex-Lord Chancellor so far as was in his power, or was deemed to be prudent. Bacon was permitted to exercise his legal subtlety in the dictation of his own pardon, and it was signed and sent to Bacon, eventually, in precisely the form in which he desired to have it. Mr. Spedding thinks that he also drew up the warrants and wrote the preamble. Knowing all this, we should not be surprised to learn that Bacon included in the pardon the remission of any penalty to which he might be liable upon the discovery of such a corrupt bargain as that to which he had obtained Jonson's acquiescence. A copy of the docket is preserved among the Cotton MSS., and Bacon was specially pardoned "for all corrupt bargains, concealments, deceits, and other like offences."* The Lord Keeper objected to the form of the pardon, and for a time the pardon was "steyed," one of the Lord Keeper's objections being to the insertion of clauses which pardoned Bacon for *interlining, stealing away, altering of writings, records, etc.* (VII., 311.) Finally, however, before December 16, 1621, the pardon, just as it was, had passed the seal. (VII., 317.) We can very well understand that when, under such circumstances, Bacon was so strenuous for this particular form of pardon, the suspicions which the King had entertained would be strengthened; the ex-Lord Chancellor's impudent offer to devote himself to philosophical studies would be fittingly spurned, and the desire to relieve his pressing necessities weakened, if not altogether destroyed. Bacon wanted assistance from the King, and the King "knew," says Mr. Spedding, "that for the effectual performance of any work of this kind, an unembarrassed income is one of the most indispensable conditions. This was all that was wanted, and it is difficult to believe that the King could not have found means of supplying it without any risk of putting his Parliaments out of temper." (L. and L., VII.,

*A copy of the document may be found in Vol. VII., page 307, of the *Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, edited by Mr. Spedding.

294.) "But in the meantime," says his biographer, "how did the King now feel towards him (June, 1622)? His bounties, even those which cost no money, had not flowed very freely as yet. Neither the *History* nor the offer of the *Digest of Laws* had met with any such response as they invited. It was difficult not to suspect that since the days when Buckingham spoke so confidently of pardons and pensions, some change had come over the King's mind. And the thing was only too likely." (VII., 386.)

Of the alleged testimonies to Bacon which are to be found in *The Discoveries*, it must suffice here to say that so far as they refer to Bacon being the author of the *Philosophical Works*, they are not trustworthy; and for these reasons: 1st. These testimonies were *not* published during Jonson's lifetime. 2^d. There can be no reasonable doubt that after Jonson's death, Toby Matthew, when preparing Bacon's correspondence in order that it might be safely published, had access to the poet's papers, and could have erased, disguised, and interpolated to his heart's content. 3^d. Jonson addressed congratulatory verses to Bacon in 1620, but in these there is nothing which suggests to any one that Bacon was the author of the *Philosophical Works*, though the *Advancement of Learning* had issued from the press fifteen years before; and it is hardly likely that, when Jonson was seeking praises to bestow upon the Lord Chancellor, he would have avoided all mention of the greatest compliment that could have been bestowed upon him. 4th. Jonson, in the same work in which the alleged testimonies are found, expressly contradicts them. Those who have carefully read Lord Bacon's last will and testament should remember the language in which, referring to the *Philosophical Works*, which were then called his, Bacon leaves his "name and memory" to future ages. Now Jonson: "NO GREAT WORK, OR WORTHY OF PRAISE OR MEMORY, BUT CAME OUT OF POOR CRADLES." (*Works*, p. 753.) That is Jonson's solemn declaration, and how can we honestly resist the conclusion which he has forced upon us, that Bacon was not the author of the *Novum Organum*?

Since I commenced the study of this subject, I have learned that Eugene Reichel has published in Stuttgart a critical study entitled *Who Wrote the Novum Organon?* "That the writer of the work," says *The Nation* (September 29, 1887), "could not be Francis Bacon, Reichel argues, not without plausibility." "By an elaborate analysis, [he] detects, in the *Novum Organon*, an original work, overlaid, and often marred, by Baconian superfetation—a work more poetical, and, indeed, philosophical, than was to be expected from Bacon's make of mind. Satisfied thus that Bacon plagiarized everything worth having in the book which is the corner-stone of his fame, the Teutonic critic next inquires who was the real writer of the manuscript. The final conclusion of Reichel is that the true originator of the world-famous and epoch-making *Organon* was a teacher of Bacon's, who, taken suddenly sick, on his deathbed intrusted his philosophical manuscript for publication to his promising pupil. That Bacon—aware that dead men tell no tales—should have stamped the work here and there with his own finger-marks in order to hide the real authorship, and, having thus disguised his stealings, should bring them before the world as all his own, and *The Greatest Birth of Time*, was quite in keeping with the character of a man whom Pope damned to everlasting infamy as the 'meanest of mankind.' " If Reichel had been fully aware of the intimacy which existed between Bacon and Jonson, he would doubtless have anticipated the argument which has been attempted in these pages.

When Jonson paid that eventful visit to Drummond to confer with and to confide in him, he gave him a description of the Imprese which he had adopted. "An Imprese," Camden says (*Remains*, p. 158, ed. 1605), "is a devise in picture with his Motto, or Word, borne by noble and learned personages, to notifie some particular conceit of their owne."

"It will be remembered," says Holmes, *Authorship of Shakespeare*, p. 337, "that Bacon's scheme of philosophy constituted a kind of intellectual globe or full circle."

Now Jonson's "Imprese" "was a compass with one foot in centre, the other broken (used as a crest); the word (motto)

Deest quod duceret orbem. His arms were three spindles or rhombi ; his own word (motto) about them, *Percunctabor, or Perscrutator.*" (*Drummond of Hawthornden*, Macmillan, 1873, pp. 100, 101.)

If Jonson intended to convey the idea that the circle would never be completed under Bacon's name ; but that if it had been undertaken, as it should rightfully have been, under the name of Jonson, then the "full circle" should have been drawn, he could not have expressed his meaning more clearly. But, alas ! that was wanting, his name.

DEEST QUOD DUCERET ORBEM

That is wanting which, were it present, would draw the circle.

(And, under the three spindles,) PERSCRUTATOR

Thorough Investigator.

Language is powerless to impart conviction, if by this Jonson does not convince us that he was indeed the author of *The Great Instauration*. The broken compass signified that that was wanting which, had it been present, would have completed the intellectual circle ; Poetry, Philosophy, and History were the three spindles from which the thread was unwound that was woven into the gorgeous raiment which unworthy Bacon wore.

Yes, in spite of the disguisings, defacings, and erasures, though manhood was outraged, friendship violated, and a world deceived, we can clearly discern that the so-called Baconian Philosophy was the work of Jonson. The evidence is complete, though an ignoble ambition has done its worst.

" I rather thought, and with religion think,
Had all the characters of love been lost,
Its lines, dimensions, and whole signature
Razed and defaced, with dull humanity,
That both his nature and his essence might
Have found their *mighty Instauration* here :
Here, where the confluence of fair and good
Meets to make up all beauty."

(*Jonson's Works*, p. 422.)

I reserve the Parallelisms for a concluding paper.

ALFRED WAITES.

(To be concluded.)

A PLEA FOR CASSIUS.

 CAREFUL reading of *Julius Cæsar*, comparing it with Plutarch, ought to convince the most sceptical that Shakespeare never intended Cassius to be quite the villain so many persist in thinking him. The real villains, as portrayed by the poet, sometimes teach, indirectly, a sublime code of ethics, but seldom or never put it to any practical use, as did Cassius. That he was not "the noblest Roman of them all" may be true, but Brutus called him "the last of the Romans," adding that it was impossible the City should ever again produce so great a spirit. Plutarch further says: "Cassius had a natural hatred and rancor against the whole race of tyrants;" moreover, he was a brave soldier, a patriotic citizen, and a true friend: three qualities incompatible with our idea of a man not actuated by noble impulses. A proof, however, of his worth may be found in the fact of his having many friends among "the choice and master spirits" of his age; among which were Messala, Decius, Titinius, Brutus, and others. This is the more remarkable when one considers that, though a disciple of Epicurus, he was the last man one would have selected as harboring Epicurean doctrines. Of a nature stern and unyielding, a disposition rash and irritable, "that carries anger as the flint bears fire, and straight is cold again," together with a plentiful lack of all those surface qualities that go to make up the man of the world, he was the direct antithesis of Pompey, "the pink of courtesy," who scratched his head with one finger, much to the disgust of the Roman populace, and of Antony, the brave, handsome "masker and reveller," who swayed the people in whatsoever manner he desired. There must have been some sterling qualities in the man whom a choice few loved and the many respected. It has always been a matter of regret that Shakespeare did not give us the speech of Cassius, that we might better judge touching his motives in the death of Cæsar. There is no doubt that, for the sake of dramatic effect, the real nobility of Cassius was

somewhat subordinated to make the "general honest thought" of Brutus more apparent ; for he, not Cæsar, is the real hero of the tragedy, and as such received all those touches Shakespeare knew so well how to bestow. Our idea of Cassius has been mostly derived from the oft-quoted words of Cæsar, "Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look ; he thinks too much," and "Let me have men about me that are fat." In reality those words were addressed to Brutus also. Mark Antony answered Cæsar by saying Cassius was "a Roman and well given ;" and it is really absurd that he should be shorn of a moiety of his good name because the "mighty Julius" sighed "Would he were fatter." In truth it was not Cassius' "lean and hungry" looks that made Cæsar deem him dangerous ; but he knew Cassius as a "great observer," one who could look "quite through the deeds of men," and was properly conscious of having given him grounds for discontent. The sight of the two friends together, doubtless, suggested to his mind that little episode of the lions at Malgara, and the shabby trick he had played him about the prætorship, when his fondness for Brutus got the better of his judgment. "At this time," says Plutarch, "Brutus had only the reputation of his honor and virtue to oppose to the many and gallant actions performed by Cassius against the Parthians," and Cæsar himself adds : "Cassius has the stronger plea, but we must let Brutus be first prætor." Yet Brutus says in *Julius Cæsar*, "To speak truth of Cæsar, I have not known when his affections sway'd more than his reason." Cassius had befriended Cæsar more than once, and doubtless felt keenly the injustice of having a younger and less experienced man preferred to himself. He may have been, therefore, somewhat biased by personal feelings, though we find this in "*Antony and Cleopatra*" :

"What was it
That moved pale Cassius to conspire? And what
Made the all honour'd honest, Roman Brutus,
With the arm'd rest, courtiers of beauteous freedom,
To drench the Capitol, but that they would
Have one man but a man?"

Observe here that the motives of Brutus and Cassius are identical. Cassius dwells upon the same idea in speaking of Brutus:

“When could they say till now that talked of Rome,
That her wide walls encompass'd but *one man!*”

He also says he was “born free as Cæsar,” and “That part of tyranny that I do bear I can shake off at pleasure,” and “Cassius from bondage will deliver Cassius,” and “I had as lief not be, as live to be in awe of such a thing as I myself”: that is, afraid to utter my own sentiments, bound like a madman is, to walk under the huge legs of this colossus that strides the world, and “peep about to find dishonorable graves.” The basal thought of his mind was Freedom. He called the conspiracy an enterprise of “honorable dangerous consequences.” He did not enter into it for mere personal aggrandizement, but to escape from a bondage his spirit could ill brook. His first words after the assassination were “Liberty, freedom, and enfranchisement,” and this lofty sentiment was echoed by Brutus in his cry of “Peace, freedom, and liberty.” He also believed that “men at some time are masters of their fates,” and being, as Cæsar said, a reader, a thinker, and a great observer, it followed, as a natural sequence, that the present struck him as the proper time to rid Rome of a tyrant. In personal action he was not below Cæsar, and with his bravery combined much shrewdness and tact—two things in which Brutus was sadly deficient—though, as found later on, rather than appear stubborn, but against his better judgment, he yielded to Brutus. “I think it not meet,” says this wise soldier, that “Mark Antony should outlive Cæsar.” But Brutus’ heart prevailed and Antony was spared; his voice was raised in opposition to Antony speaking at Cæsar’s funeral, knowing the power of his eloquence on the people; but again the blind faith of Brutus triumphed, and Antony incited a mob that drove the conspirators from Rome. On another occasion, when Brutus, speaking of Antony, says, “I know we shall have him well to friend,” Cassius shrewdly replies, “I wish we may, but yet I have a mind that fears him much,” and it is, doubtless, to counteract

the credulity of Brutus, that he appeals to Antony's well-known love for power, and promises him : "Your voice shall be as strong as any man's in the disposing of new dignities." In fact, "the whole design to liberate their country fails from the generous temper and overweening confidence of Brutus in the goodness of their cause and the assistance of others." Cassius, finding that Brutus would not subscribe to his policy, did the next best thing his judgment dictated. Surmising that Antony was "A trout to be caught by tickling," he baited the hook accordingly. Unfortunately his bait proved less attractive than that offered by Octavius Cæsar. Any one of us can appreciate the bitter satisfaction Cassius must have felt some time later, when he made the first and only allusion to these circumstances; on the day of the battle, when in their conference, Antony's tongue wagged in noise so rude against them, Cassius (stung to the quick by the words of this "limb of Cæsar," whom Brutus had declared "could do no more than Cæsar's arm when Cæsar's head is off") cries to his brother :

"Now, Brutus, thank yourself.
This tongue had not offended so to-day,
If Cassius might have ruled."

The "itching palm," of which Brutus complained, is, after all, the fine scorn that an ultra-generous nature often feels for one possessing more thrift. Cassius had divided his money more than once with his brother; who, it must be confessed, was somewhat of a prodigal; but, at Brutus' demands, gave him a third of what he had raised for the needs of his own soldiers. Indeed, in this case, Cassius was something of a catspaw, gaining a not enviable reputation for cruelty and parsimony in order to satisfy his own legions, while Brutus, on the other hand, scorning the sometimes harsh measures necessary in times of war to sustain an army, was not averse to receiving the "rascal counters" thus obtained from his more practical brother. In reading the tragedies of *Julius Cæsar* and *Marcus Brutus* by John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham, it is evident that he felt Cassius had not received his meed of praise. These tragedies, of no intrinsic value, are interesting viewed in this light,

and the nobility of Cassius in *Marcus Brutus* is particularly accentuated. The last scene of all in the history of these two men stamps Cassius the "noble Roman" Brutus loved to call him. In all of Shakespeare there is no sadder scene than the "everlasting farewell" of these two mistaken patriots. A parting, to them in their ignorance of Christianity, "past hope, past cure." Can anything be sadder than the words of Brutus?

"Forever, and forever, farewell Cassius !
If we do meet again, why, we shall smile ;
If not, why then, this parting was well made."

And their echo by Cassius :

"Forever, and forever, farewell Brutus !
If we do meet again we'll smile indeed ;
If not, 'tis true this parting was well made."

Just before the battle, Brutus says, "For I have already given my life to my country on the 'Ides of March,' and have lived since then a second life for her sake with liberty and honor." At these words Cassius smiled, and, embracing Brutus, said, "With these resolutions let us go upon the enemy, for either we ourselves shall conquer, or have no cause to fear those that do." The result of the battle at Philippi again justified his fears. It was fought on Cassius' birthday. His judgment warned him against going to meet the enemy, but Brutus again prevailed; he asked for the command of the right wing: this too was denied him. What the result might have been, had he been in command, is a matter of conjecture; but, history tells us, Brutus' army, carried away by success, stopped to plunder and left the other unprotected, and Cassius, supposing his brother overcome, withdrew and sent Titinius for news of the battle. Titinius found his friends, who surrounded him, shouting; but Cassius, at this point in his career, made a mistake common to people of his impetuous nature: he mistook the shouts for those of the enemy, and at once concluded his messenger was taken. Then it is he cries, "Through too much fondness of life I have lived to endure the sight of my friend taken by the enemy before my face." Shakespeare uses this

incident with beautiful and pathetic effect : " Oh, coward that I am, to live so long to see my best friend ta'en before my face ! " With these words Cassius seized the sword " that ran through Cæsar's bowels " and finished his mortal act. Cassius was particularly happy in having two such friends as Titinius and Brutus, both of whom survived him long enough to report him aright to the unsatisfied. Titinius says :

"Brutus, come apace,
And see how I regarded Caius Cassius.
By your leave, gods :—this is a Roman part :
Come, Cassius' sword, and find Titinius' heart."

But in the words of Brutus, " whose love is a patent which establishes a man's nobility," may be found Cassius' most fitting eulogy :

"The last of all the Romans, fare thee well !
It is impossible that ever Rome
Should breed thy fellow."

KATE L. GALLAGHER.

Miscellany.

QUOTING from the paper on Halliwell-Phillipps in our February issue, *The Nation* says :

"The most memorable work of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps is his 'Outlines.' This opinion expresses the feeling of every true Shakespearian. When outsiders ask, ' Why do we know so little about Shakespeare ? ' the best answer is, ' Because you have not read, or certainly have not marked and inwardly digested, Phillipps's "Outlines," especially the seventh edition.' Seeing how all the world has been taxed for elaborating this monumental work, we are at once constrained to echo the saying, ' It is not likely that any scraps of knowledge will be added to what is contained in these volumes.' What shall the man do who cometh after the king ? But had Phillipps lived a year longer, he would have added a good many such scraps. Witness the growth of the 'Outlines,' year by year, even up to

the last edition. His favorite haunts were the New Record Office and the British Museum, and he seldom entered either without gathering up some Shakespearian fragments. He was, in truth, a magnet to such fragments, which attracted them out of hiding-places where no one would ever look for them. ‘No likelihood of any further scraps of Shakespearian knowledge’! What will Mr. Furness say to the following, which a lucky chance has just thrown in our way?

“In an indenture between the Right Honorable Sir Richard Saltonstall, Knt., Lord Mayor of London, and two other commissioners of her Majesty (fortieth year of Queen Elizabeth), and the parties deputed to collect the first of three subsidies granted by Parliament the year preceding,—bearing date 1 Oct. 1598, for the rate of St. Helen’s Parish, Bishopgate ward,—the name of William Shakespeare is found as liable with others to that rate.”

“This scrap was unknown to Halliwell-Phillipps. He with other prophets and kings desired it long, but died without the sight.

“In the ‘Outlines’ there is but one statement concerning the local habitation of Shakespeare in London. It is in these words: ‘At this time, 1596, he appears to have been residing when in town in lodgings near the Bear Garden in Southwark’ (Vol. I., p. 130, 7th ed.). Only this and nothing more. Thanks to the tax-record, we can say where his residence *was*, not merely where it ‘appears to have been.’ Mr. Phillipps gives no authority for his opinion concerning Shakespeare’s lodgings. We have legal proof that his abode two years after was in St. Helen’s parish. Crosby Hall in St. Helen’s parish is sometimes visited by Americans as the scene of assignation between Gloster (not yet Richard III.) and Lady Anne, and also the place where Catesby was to report to Gloster the progress of the plot for chopping off Hastings’s head. It will be visited ten times oftener, thanks to our proof that Shakespeare’s home was close by that hall, and that, too, about the time, if not at the exact time, when *Richard III.* was written. Indeed, the proximity of that Crosby Hall, of Gothic massiveness and oaken ceilings and historic associations, may have led to the selection of Richard as the subject of a play. No trace of the Bear Garden can be discovered. Crosby Hall is the best preserved mediæval building in the metropolis. The scrap we have raked from the dust of old oblivion, if known to Mr. Phillipps, would have become the starting-point of a new departure, ‘a small prick to a subsequent volume.’ His research was in many lines, but does not appear to have extended to tax-lists. But, once having caught the scent, he would have ferreted out every document on London taxes in the period of

Shakespeare's life there. Such a search is the duty of those on whom his mantle has fallen. The worm-hole of long-vanished days from which we plucked this gem we refrain from mentioning, till we learn whether it is known to any writer for SHAKESPEARIANA. The discoverer of the indenture did not tell anybody of his Kohinoor, but hid it in a place where nobody would look for it."

[*The Nation's* contributor is on the track of a mare's nest, so far as the above "discovery" is concerned. The residence in St. Helen's parish is certainly well enough known, and is referred to plentifully enough in Lectures, Biographies, and Itineraries. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps's method with his "*Outlines*" was to print new editions as fast as he finished "working up" (to use his own term) consecutive details. His untimely death interrupted all. Ignorance, or neglect of details not included in these editions as far as they had gone, can hardly be predicated of the work, still less of the genial, earnest, self-forgetful, industrious, and methodical scholar who produced them.—EDS. S.]

EDITORS SHAKESPEARIANA: Lest I should be misunderstood by Mr. Lawrence and your other readers, allow me to explain that I never had the slightest idea that Mr. Donnelly's cryptogram could hold water, much less bottle-ale. But from the fact that this beverage is mentioned by Shakespeare himself, I thought we should allow Mr. Donnelly all the comfort he can derive from it, and so expressed myself in the communication to your magazine to which Mr. Lawrence refers.

Let me cite another quotation from Shakespeare:

"The Myrmidons are no bottle-ale houses." (*Twelfth Night*, II., iii., 27.)

Of course, the humor of this passage lies in the fact that it is something "no fellow can find out"—least of all Sir Andrew, who for this reason pronounces it "the best fooling," etc. Still we must admit that an alehouse at which bottle-ale only could be sold was a possibility in Shakespeare's day, or we rob the clown's fooling of its charm. Now could it be possible that the heel-taps left in the bottles of the average mariners of the day could be collected in such quantities as to supply an alehouse? If this be so, my faith in what the elder Weller would call the "powers of suction" of these mariners is terribly shaken.

Until Mr. Lawrence can give us chapter and verse for his statement regarding "the only ale in bottles," I strongly incline to the conjecture that bottle-ale was nothing more nor less than small-beer, a grade of ale well known in Shakespeare's time, and doubtless the same as the bottled beer which English boys at the public schools still drink on festive occasions—a kind of ale which it is necessary to keep tightly bottled because it is of so weak a character that it would otherwise be spoiled in a short time.

In this view of the case, allow me to suggest that Doll Tear-sheet's use of bottle-ale as an adjective may be interpreted as *frothy* and *weak-spirited*, which suits my own fancy as applied to Pistol much better than *stale*, as Mr. Lawrence would have it.

It would, I know, take away from Mr. Donnelly some grains of comfort if he should interpret bottle-ale as small-beer, for it would indicate that Shakespeare was temperate rather than parsimonious, which would never do for Mr. Donnelly, but will do very well for us, as Mrs. Stopes has recently shown.

Norwich, Conn.

JONATHAN TRUMBULL.

EDITORS SHAKESPEARIANA : I have to thank you for permission to read the above. Mr. Trumbull's defence of the Donnelly *Menu* seems to resolve itself into the question, "Did Shakespeare have small-beer as well as (or instead of) 'swipes' on his table in Stratford-upon-Avon?" This question seems to me disposed of by Mr. Morgan's letter and by the considerations and facts I was able to submit in my note which you were kind enough to print in your April issue.

In calling for "chapter and verse" it seems to me that Mr. Trumbull forgets that he, and not I, have the burden of proof. But, letting that pass, Mr. Trumbull, I think, by his further citation shows that "bottle-ale" was used in Shakespeare's day as a term of contempt. And so indeed was, and is to-day, the term "small beer." If Mr. Trumbull has "chapter and verse" ready to hurl at me, he will not need mine. Shakespeare himself, quaffing huge drafts from his great tankards of home-

brewed, would have doubtless called me a "bottle-ale rascal," a "small-beer rascal," had I insinuated that New Place was "a bottle-ale house, or that he, the owner, set either "swipes" or small beer before his guests. And why shouldn't that inexplicable clown's speech, "The Myrmidons are no bottle-ale houses" (*Twelfth Night*, II., iii., 273), which the commentators generally admit (when they don't dodge it altogether) that they don't understand, mean simply, "You are very drunk, Sir Toby. You have been drinking at the Myrmidons (or ale that came from the Myrmidons—a tavern in the vicinity), and that is (or are—see Abbott's Shakespeare Grammar) no stale ale house (or houses). In other words, the Myrmidons beer is very strong, and you are full of it." It seems to me that the further the discussion goes, the use of the epithet "bottle-ale" as a term of reproach (not as an adjective meaning "frothy," which is not necessarily a term of reproach) becomes the more apparent. Reserving my "chapter and verse" for the present, therefore, I have only to say that I feel perfectly sure that the phrase *was* a term of reproach, simply from the proverbial condition of the ale that reached England in bottles, in Shakespeare's time.

New York, May 15.

DENNETH LAWRENCE.

THE great feature in the Shakespeare Anniversary celebration at Stratford-on-Avon this year was the production at the handsome Memorial Theatre of the *First Part of Henry VI*. This historical play has not been presented in the original text since the time of the poet, but mutilated editions have been produced within the last century. Mr. C. E. Flower considers that the Memorial stage is the proper place whereon to produce the seldom acted plays of his illustrious townsman, and for this purpose he made great preparations for the representation of *Henry VI*. The scenery was designed by Mr. John O'Connor, R.I., and painted by Mr. T. W. Hall, and was remarkably effective. The opening scene, representing the body of Henry V. lying in state in Westminster Abbey, was painted with much skill, and that representing the English army before Bordeaux would have done credit to the London stage. Mr. Flower's

Memorial edition of the play was adopted, which exhibits a very conscientious reverence for the text. Mr. Osmond Tearle (whose company was engaged for the occasion) gave a fine representation of John Talbot, the fearless, daring, and self-confident soldierly bearing of the man being realized with great force. In short, the character was profoundly conceived, acted with infinite care, and elaborated with rare skill. The other parts were very carefully played, and the whole representation reflected the highest credit on all parties concerned. Many Shakespeare scholars were present, and the general judgment was that the play had been presented with a completeness and grandeur of scenery rarely witnessed even in the metropolis. *Julius Cæsar* was also performed for the first time in Shakespeare's town, and evoked great enthusiasm. Mr. Tearle played Brutus and met with a most cordial reception, being called several times before the curtain; as also were Cassius (Mr. Lever) and Mark Antony (Mr. Conway). A new forum scene, designed by Mr. John O'Connor, was received with unmistakable marks of approval. The play proceeded smoothly to the finish, and gave the utmost satisfaction to a well-filled house. The railway ran special trains for the accommodation of the surrounding districts. The entire programme for Jubilee week was as follows: Monday, April 22, *Julius Cæsar*; Tuesday, April 23, *Henry VI. (Part I.)*; Wednesday, April 24, *Virginius*; Thursday, April 25, *Julius Cæsar*; Friday, April 26, *Henry VI. (Part I.)*; Saturday (afternoon), April 27, *Henry VI. (Part I.)*; Saturday (evening), April 27, same.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO LORD BACON.—“In no history of America, in no life of Bacon, have I found one word to connect him with the plantation of the great Republic. Yet, like Raleigh and Delaware, he took an active share in the labors, a conspicuous part in the sacrifices through which the foundations of Virginia and the Carolinas were laid. Like men of less note, who have received far higher honors in America, Bacon paid his money into the great company, and took office in its management as one of the Council. To his other glories,

therefore, must be added that of a Founder of New States. The causes which led Bacon, with most of his parliamentary and patriotic colleagues, to join first the Virginia Company, then the Newfoundland Company, with person and purse, were the same causes which moved him to write against Parsons, to welcome Antonio Perez, to vote against Queen Mary, to contend for the Union, and to plead for supplies: the plantation of Virginia was a branch of the great contest with Spain. . . . While the Queen lived, and Raleigh was free to spend his genius and his fortune in the work of discovery and plantation, it never flagged. But, when James came in, and in his dread of heroism and adventure flung the explorer of Guiana, the founder of Virginia, into the Tower, as a first step towards receiving the Spanish Ambassador Velasco, with proposals for a shameful peace, the old English spirit appeared to droop.

. . . Ruled by a corporation of adventurers, tormented by Spanish cruisers, unprotected by the royal fleets, the colony was on the verge of failure, when a threat from Spain to descend on the Chesapeake shot new life into the drooping cause. All generous spirits rushed to the defence of Virginia. Bacon, Montgomery, Pembroke, Southampton joined the company with purse and voice. The ardent Abbott, the learned Hackluyt lent their names; money poured in; a fleet commanded by Gates and Somers sailed from the Thames, to meet on its voyage at sea those poetic storms and trials which added Bermudas to our empire and the *Tempest* to our literature."—*Hepworth Dixon.*

IN *Macbeth*, Act IV., sc. i., lines 94 to 103, the original reading of all the old editions is as follows:

Macbeth. Rebellious dead, rise never till the wood
Of Birnam rise, and our high-plac'd Macbeth
Shall live the lease of nature, pay his breath
To time and mortal custom.

Here all subsequent editors, with the single exception of Halowell (1865), follow Theobald (1733) in changing "rebellious dead" to "rebellion's head," or "rebellious head." They inter-

pret "rebellion's head" as meaning a rebellious body of men, or insurgent force, making head against the king. Convinced that they are wrong, we venture to restore the old text in our edition of the play, and for the following reasons: Our principle of interpretation is that of Dr. Johnson: "My first labor," said he, "is always to turn the old text on every side, and try if there be any interstice through which light can find its way." Attempts to improve upon the language of Shakespeare are always hazardous. Now what was uppermost in Macbeth's mind at the time he uttered the words quoted? Not insurrection or revolt. He had heard indirectly that Macduff had declined the invitation to the banquet; but thus far there had been no rebellion nor any opposition to Macbeth, other than the defiant conduct of Banquo's ghost. Slain at dusk the evening before, with "twenty trenched gashes on his head," the dead man had apparently risen, and menacingly nodded and shaken his gory locks at the king. In the light of that dreadful banquet scene we venture to hold the opinion that it was not so much a general rebellion, raising its head against him, that Macbeth feared; but chiefly the rebellious Banquo, dead indeed, but twice risen, and capable of rising again, to overthrow the usurper. There had been no rebellion yet, nor had any been threatened other than that implied by the terrible phantom shaking its blood-boltered locks; but the dreadful shape that the night before had blanched his cheeks and made his firm nerves tremble must have haunted him every instant. There is no need of changing "dead" to "head," but, if we do change it, let us believe that the head is that of the murdered but still living Banquo.—*Homer B. Sprague, in The Student.*

WE announce, with very great regret, the death of Mr. Frederick Hawley, the librarian of the Shakespeare Memorial, who was appointed to that post about three years ago, and devoted himself to the duties with such zeal and industry that the library has now attained proportions that few anticipated it would reach in so short a space of time. Every year has witnessed a vast accession to the number of useful and valuable

books of a distinctly Shakespearean character, and we believe the forthcoming report will show an increase greatly in excess of any former experience. This gratifying state of things is to be ascribed largely to the assiduity of Mr. Hawley. Everything he did was done out of pure love for the work entrusted to him. He had just about six weeks ago completed a manuscript catalogue of all the known editions of Shakespeare's plays in every language, and this will stand as a monument to his perseverance and industry. There is no other such complete catalogue in existence. As a specimen of what can be done in caligraphy perhaps nothing could be found to compare with it. Other work of a valuable character might also be mentioned, but it is sufficient to say that the library has been immensely benefited by his services.—*Stratford-on-Avon Herald.*

A FIRST FOLIO in excellent preservation is said to have been discovered in the city of Mexico, and purchased from an ignorant dealer for an insignificant price. The Robert Lenox Kennedy Folio, mentioned by Mr. Fleming on page 111 of Volume V. of *SHAKESPEARIANA*, was recently sold at auction in New York City for \$1400.

THE sale of that portion of the library of the late J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps which his nephew has decided to dispose of at public auction will take place next month in London, and will embrace about one thousand lots.

MR. FRANK MARSHALL, editor of "The Henry Irving Shakespeare," is studious and well-meaning, but he has lately written one or two letters which might lead the public to believe that he puts Irving before Shakespeare in more senses than one. To defend Mr. Irving's conception of Macbeth is one thing; to defend his liberties with the play and text is another. For example, when Macbeth—I mean the real Macbeth—hears of his wife's death, he begins an impressive soliloquy with the sentence, "She should have died hereafter." Mr. Irving substitutes

"would" for "should," and Mr. Marshall upholds him in a change which turns a suggestive phrase into a platitude. The reason for condemning it, however, is not merely or mainly rhetorical. If there be an accepted canon of Shakespearian criticism it is that no conjectural emendation shall be made where the text is intelligible and consistent. "Improvements" to suit the taste of this or that editor are not to be tolerated. If there are two or more texts the righteous editor is not even then to let fancy dictate his choice. He is to accept, other things being equal, the best authority. For the text of *Macbeth* there is but one authority, the Folio of 1623, when the play was first printed, seven years after Shakespeare's death. There are no *Macbeth* quartos. The Folio reads "should," and the reading, being intelligible and consistent—making good sense, to put it short—is decisive. Mr. Frank Marshall's defense of Mr. Irving's "would" is itself entirely indefensible.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

* EDITORS SHAKESPEARIANA : Your correspondent's question apropos of "In the soup," as to whether any piece of modern slang has yet been invented which cannot be found suggested in Shakespeare, reminds me to write you that the expressions "Painting the town red" and "It's a cold day when I get left," both of which appeared in these forms within the last six or ten years, are both, almost literally, in Shakespeare. The one in *I. Henry Fourth*, II., iv., 13, where Falstaff says :

"They call drinking deep, dyeing scarlet";

and the other in *Cymbeline*, II., iii., 1, when the "First lord" says to Cloten :

"Your lordship is the most patient man in loss, the very coldest that ever turned up an ace."

And Cloten replies :

"It would make any man cold to lose!"

New York, March 17, 1889.

R.

Shakespeare Societies.

APRIL MEETING OF THE SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY OF NEW YORK.—At the triennial meeting of the Board of Trustees the following officers were elected to serve for the coming three years :

President, Appleton Morgan, A. M., LL. B.; Chairman of Board of Trustees, W. W. Nevin, Esq.; Vice-President, Thos. R. Price, A.M., LL.D. (Chair of English, Columbia College); Treasurer, Jas. E. Reynolds, Esq.; Secretary, Wm. H. Fleming, Esq.; Librarian, B. Rush Field, M.D. The President read his Report for four years last past as follows:

TO THE TRUSTEES—*Gentlemen* : I have the honor to make the following report :

The Articles of Incorporation of the Shakespeare Society of New York were approved by the Hon. George B. Barrett, a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, on April 18, 1885, and filed in the proper office upon that day.

On the evening of April 24, 1885, the trustees named in said Articles of Incorporation—Appleton Morgan, James E. Reynolds, A. Chalmers Hinton, R. S. Guernsey, and Albert R. Frey—met at the residence of James E. Reynolds, Esq., No. 104 West 38th Street, in the city of New York, and effected a temporary organization. The Articles of Incorporation and certificates being then read, and it appearing that the Society had received its statutory incorporation by full compliance with the statutes of the State of New York, said trustees proceeded to effect its permanent organization by election of officers to serve for one year as follows: President, Appleton Morgan; Vice-President, R. S. Guernsey; Treasurer, James E. Reynolds; Secretary, Charles C. Marble; Librarian, Albert R. Frey. All of these officers served until the end of the term for which they were elected, except Mr. Guernsey, who resigned both as a member and as an officer of the Society, on account of removal from the city, on April 8, 1886, on which day his resignation was, at his request, accepted.

The first stated meeting of the Society was held at the residence of Mr. Reynolds, and the Constitution and By-Laws of this Society were then adopted, upon being read and voted upon

section by section. Here the Society thereafter continued to assemble, except that by the courtesy of M. H. Mallory & Company, proprietors of *The Churchman*, the Society occupied for a time two large rooms at No. 47 Lafayette Place. On October 24, 1885, by the kindness and procurement of Dr. Barnard, the late beloved and revered President of Columbia College, whom this Society will not cease to hold in grateful memory, the Trustees of Columbia College invited this Society to occupy spacious apartments in Hamilton Hall of that university. This courtesy the Society accepted, passing a vote of thanks to Dr. Barnard and to the Board of Trustees, and since has made its home within the hospitable walls of that university. By invitation of the same institution the Society has resolved to deposit its library in the massive and fire-proof alcoves of the Columbia College library, and though formal arrangements to that end have not yet been completed, owing to a vacancy in the office of the librarian of the college, the Society has assurances of the conclusion of such formalities at an early date, a committee of this Society now being in communication with the trustees of Columbia College in regard to the matter.

At the first stated meeting of the Society, the Society honored itself by electing as its first honorary member the late learned and beloved James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps, Esq., of Hollinbury Copse, Brighton, England, who accepted the election in a most grateful and complimentary letter to the Society. Subsequent honorary members elected by the Society have been as follows: Carl Elze, Ph.D., Stuttgart, Germany; Charles Mansfield Ingleby, LL.D., Valentines, Ilford, England; David Thomas Morgan, Esq., Whips Cross, Walthamstow, Essex, England; Rev. Henry Paine Stokes, A.M., Wolverhampton, England; Samuel Timmins, Esq., Birmingham, England; George Frederick Holmes, LL.D., University of Virginia, Virginia; Hon. Cushman K. Davis, St. Paul, Minnesota. The mortality among the above list has been exceptionally large. D. T. Morgan, Esq., died at Whips Cross, November 4, 1886; Dr. Ingleby died November 18, 1886; Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps died January 3, 1889, and Dr. Elze died January 23, 1889. As the Society has proposed from the outset that the title of "Honorary Member of the New York Shakespeare Society" should have weight and meaning, the vacancies on this list—which was deliberately selected—will be most deliberately filled, the constitution providing that only persons who shall be "of recognized eminence as an author, editor, or compiler of Shakespearian drama, or of the Elizabethan drama, or of works or matters re-

lating thereto, and who shall be recommended by the Executive Committee," shall be eligible as honorary members.

THE LIBRARY.

The library of the New York Shakespeare Society it is proposed to ultimately make an honor to the city of the Society's birth. At present, though not imposing in bulk or of large significance, compared to the great collections of the world, it is believed that the Society is proceeding in the sure and proper way to make its increase sure and its value permanent. Judicious purchases are made by order of the Executive Committee on recommendation of the Library Committee, and contributions have been and are constantly being added by its friends. It is hoped that by the absorption of the private libraries of certain members who have pledged themselves to bequeath them to the Society, our library will ultimately become one of the largest and most practicable working Shakespearian libraries in the United States, and our members are urgently requested to assist to further that end, not only by contributions of books, but by losing no opportunity of representing to others the permanent condition of security under which the Society will deposit its library with Columbia College, and the Society's assurances that Columbia College will co-operate with this Society by placing in an alcove or a group of alcoves such collection as itself may be able to make along with the library of this Society: and this Society will see to it that all donors to its library shall receive perpetuation for their collections and their names.

The following donors to our library are entitled to the thanks of the Society: The late J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, Esq., the late Dr. Carl Elze, the late Dr. C. M. Ingleby, the late D. T. Morgan, Esq., Samuel Timmins, Esq., Justin Winsor, Esq., B. Rush Field, M.D., Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls, Mrs. Evangeline M. O'Connor, Mrs. Elizabeth Wormeley Latimer, Charles F. Gunther, Esq., Mr. Herbert Janvrin Browne, Augustin Daly, Esq., Franz Thimm, Ph.D., Mr. Horace Davis, Charles F. Hansom, Esq., Charles F. Steele, Esq.

MEETINGS AND PAPERS.

The following papers have been read before the Society: 1st, "Sir William D'Avenant and the First Shakespearian Revival," Appleton Morgan, 2d, "Ecclesiastical Law in *Hamlet*, the Burial of Ophelia," R. S. Guernsey. 3d, "Some Readers of Shakespeare," C. C. Marble. 4th, "Queen Elizabeth's Share in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*," Appleton Morgan. 5th,

"Time in the Play of *Hamlet*," E. P. Vining. 6th, "Once Used Words in Shakespeare," J. D. Butler. 7th, "The First Shakespeare Society," J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps. 8th, "William Shakespeare and Alleged Spanish Prototypes," A. R. Frey. 9th, "The Types and Construction of Shakespeare's Verse as Shown in the *Othello*," Thomas R. Price. 10th, "*The Taming of the Shrew*—Did Shakespeare Write the *Quarto Version*?" Albert R. Frey. 11th, "A Plea for a Reference Canon of the Shakespeare Plays," Alvey A. Adee. 12th, "The Sonnets," William J. Rolfe. 13th, "A Bibliography of the First Folios in the City of New York," Wm. H. Fleming. 14th, "The Donnelly Myth," A. R. Frey. 15th, "Shakespeare not a Lawyer," William Reynolds. 16th, "Medico-Shakespearian Fanaticism," B. Rush Field. 17th, "Did Ben Jonson Write Bacon's Works?" Alfred Waites. 18th, "Why, How, and When William Shakespeare Became an Actor," Wm. Reynolds. The 9th Stated Meeting was devoted to an inspection of the copy of the Second Folio owned by our fellow-member Chas. F. Gunther, Esq., upon a fly-leaf of which is pasted a supposed autograph of Shakespeare's, which Mr. Gunther kindly brought from Chicago and submitted to the Society and its invited guests, a large number of whom were present on that occasion.

There have been in all twenty-six stated meetings of this Society to the date of this Report.

REGULAR PUBLICATIONS.

At the outset the Society believed that it could best serve and conserve the interest for which it was incorporated, by printing and distributing such of the papers read before it as should seem to its Executive and Publication Committees to avoid mere criticism or commentary, and which should in any way appear novel, original, and of more or less permanent value. Of the above papers, therefore, and guided by this rule, the Society has selected and published of the above the following: No. 2, No. 5, No. 6, No. 7, No. 8, No. 9. The others stand over for publication, or have been used as Bankside Introductions. The regular publications of this Society, besides the papers above enumerated, also include a *Digest of Shakespeariana* (exclusive of editions and commentaries on the text), being a list of titles of about 2350 books on Shakespearian matters, written by 660 authors, digested to 416 subjects treated; also a *Glossary of Warwickshire Dialect*, tracing its presence or absence in the Shakespearian plays and poems,

of which Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, writing to its compiler, said : "This is the only attempt of the kind in existence. I wonder it has never been thought of before;" the whole nine numbers making, when bound, two stout 12mo volumes, or about 520 pages of original and, as the Society thinks, valuable matter. Add to these the four volumes of the *Bankside Shakespeare*, and the Society has reason to be proud of its four years' work.

Nos. 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 17 have been published in the magazine *SHAKESPEARIANA*, of which this Report will speak later on.

THE BANKSIDE SHAKESPEARE.

In the first circular issued by this Society it announced its intention to begin the publication of an edition of Shakespeare upon an entirely novel plan. This was in August, 1886. Thereafter the Society appointed a committee to decide upon a method of editing, and that committee, having referred to it the able paper of Mr. Adee mentioned above, reported in favor of the system of editing recommended in that paper by Mr. Adee. Accordingly on March 13, 1888, the first volume of *The Bankside Shakespeare* was issued, and since then three others have appeared, while two others are about leaving the Riverside Press. The printing of these volumes, which are line numbered and consist of parallels of the First Quarto and First Folio texts of each play, is extremely costly, and the price being far beyond what the revenues of this Society would justify, the funds have been provided for by individual members. It is confidently believed that the completion of this edition will be and become the Society's most permanent monument; for the absolute accuracy of the reproduction of the antique types and for the notations the Society is responsible; for the Introductions preceding each volume, the individual members who are the editors are themselves responsible. These Introductions are in themselves a record of the lines of study pursued by our members and a perpetual witness of the catholic spirit of the Society itself.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY.

By clause 1 of Article Two of the Constitution, which provides for triennial elections after the first election, this Society, at its first anniversary, elected the following officers to serve for an ensuing term of three years: *President*, Appleton Morgan; *Vice-President*, Thomas R. Price; *Secretary*, Dexter H. Walker; *Librarian*, Albert R. Frey. Mr. Frey soon

after resigned as Librarian and Mr. Walker being called to Europe, Mr. William H. Fleming was appointed by the President acting Secretary, and he has continued to act as such to the date of this Report.

THE HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS BEQUEST.

By the last will and testament of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, this Society has come into possession of the entire collection (through forty years) of plates, cuts, wood-types, autotypes, electrotypes, and blocks of Shakespearian and Elizabethan pictures, portraits, plans, maps, charts, and drawings. These, amounting in bulk to about a ton's weight avoirdupois, and priceless since they can never be duplicated, will soon be in the Society's possession, being delayed in England by legal formalities only. The Society is advised by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps' executor that the state will pay the succession duty, so that the Society will be at no expense except transportation to America.

SHAKESPEARIANA.

By resolution of the Executive Committee of January, 1889, the Society was directed to accept the proposition of the Leonard Scott Publication Company, of New York City, to assume editorial control of SHAKESPEARIANA, a magazine devoted to Shakespearian matters only, which had then successfully completed its fifth year of publication. The Society accepted such editorial control and has already issued five monthly numbers, beginning with the issue for January, 1889. Under our editorial conduct this magazine—the only one published in any language of its exclusive scope—while presenting the hospitality of its columns to all students of Shakespeare, and reporting Shakespearian news and discovery from month to month, will print the papers and transactions of this Society in full, which heretofore it has only contained in abstract, as well as *The Literary World*, of Boston, such abstracts having been officially furnished to both periodicals by the Secretary of this Society. It is hoped, too, that the permission of the Executive Committee will be given to use in this magazine portions of the unique Halliwell-Phillipps electrotypes and blocks.

THE SHAKESPEARE CLUB OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

On February 5, 1889, was organized in the City of New York the above named Club, which honored this Society by electing your President a member of its Advisory Committee. I am happy to say that this Club has already 42 members and pro-

poses to do zealous and exhaustive work in Shakespearian study, with every promise of abundant success. The President of this Society has also been elected an honorary member of the Ladies' Shakespeare Society of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

THE TREASURY.

I herewith cover to you the report of our Treasurer, bearing even date with this Report, by which it appears that this Society is entirely free from debt to anybody but its Treasurer: and I am happy to be advised that the Society's income for the current year, now accruing, will make our Treasurer good, besides leaving in his hands a balance in the Society's favor.

In conclusion, I have to report that the thanks of this Society are due for courtesies as follows: To the Lenox Library for allowing photographs to be taken of its rare originals; to the Astor Library for many courtesies; to Columbia College for courtesies; to the New York Shakespeare Club; to the Grolier Club for courtesies, and to the proprietors of *The Literary World*, of Boston, and of *The Churchman*, of New York City, all of which this Society will hope to reciprocate.

The President offers his congratulations to the Society upon its having been able, in a field where the tendency toward transcendental and tropical exuberance of criticism is proverbial, and bickerings, jealousies, and quarrels not always conspicuous by their absence, to preserve a quiet, conservative, and gentlemanly course, and, as he believes, to have added matters of permanent value to the great field of Shakespeariana.

All of which is respectfully submitted.
New York, April 25, 1889. APPLETION MORGAN, President.

SHAKESPEARE CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY.—Organized February 9, 1889. Mrs. Mary F. Hoagland, President; Mrs. Frederic G. Smedley, Secretary and Treasurer. Forty-five members. Hold weekly meetings for reading and study of works of Shakespeare. Monthly social and literary receptions from November to May. The first regular meeting held at 348 West 57th Street, March 22, 1889, the President, Mrs. M. F. Hoagland in the chair. The Secretary reported the names of twenty-eight persons as members, and the Hon. Joshua L. Chamberlain and the Rev. H. S. Singleton honorary members. Miss Hortense Hibbard gave some fine instrumental, and Miss

Henley vocal music, after which President Morgan, of the Shakespeare Society of New York, gave an interesting and instructive talk upon Shakespeare's Editors. The President announced that at the ensuing meeting, April 23, 1889, the Rev. H. S. Singleton would read a paper on *King Lear*. The Club then resolved itself into a social gathering.—APRIL MEETING. Last reception for present season held April 23, 1889, at residence of Mrs. Wilson, 348 West 57th Street. The exercises began with a reading of a paper by Rev. H. S. Singleton upon *King Lear*. The paper was an exceedingly able and interesting production. The essayist took and maintained with great ability many original positions opposed to those of some prominent critics of Shakespeare. The exercises included readings and recitations by Miss King, Miss Lilian Mills, Dr. C. H. Miller, and Dr. Wm. B. Davenport. Nearly all the selections rendered were taken from the works of Shakespeare. A committee was appointed by the President to provide a permanent home for the Club.

EMMA Z. SMEDLEY, *Secretary.*

THE SUNDAY SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY, of London, held its fourteenth annual meeting at the Somerville Club, 231 Oxford Street, on Sunday, January 20, Mr. T. O. Blagg in the chair. The following report for 1888 was read and adopted:

In presenting the report for the past year the committee are glad to be able to state that the meetings have on the whole been well attended. The reading of the plays in chronological order have been concluded for the third time during the Society's existence. The plays read during the past year have been *Coriolanus*, cast by Mr. Mackay; *Timon of Athens*; *The Tempest*; *Cymbeline*; *Winter's Tale*; *Henry VIII.*, followed by a paper by Mr. Howard; *Two Noble Kinsmen* criticised by Mr. Blagg; and *Edward III.*, followed by a paper by the Hon. Secretary.

A discussion arose on the advisability of renewing the outdoor meetings, which have, of late years, been given. Mr. Elcock was asked to assist in making arrangements for at least two summer excursions, and to read the plays in chronological order. Dr. F. J. Furnivall was re-elected President; Miss Phipson was also re-elected as Treasurer, and Joseph R. Car-

ter, Esq., as Auditor. A vote of thanks was adopted to the Council of the National Sunday League for the use of its rooms during 1888, and it was resolved to hold future meetings at the Somerville Club. The play of *Marina* was then read. The order of proceedings for the current year, 1889, is as follows: February 17, *Love's Labour Lost*; March 17, *Comedy of Errors*; April 14, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*; May 19, *Romeo and Juliet*; June 16, *Richard II.*; July 21, *As You Like It* (Epping Forest); August 18, Out-door Meeting; October 20, *King John*; November 17, *Merchant of Venice*; December 15, *Taming of the Shrew*; January 19, 1890, Annual Meeting.

MISS E. PHIPSON, Hon. Sec.

THE PARIS SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY.—At the first meeting of the Shakespeare Society of Paris it was “*Resolved*, That the Society be called ‘The Shakespeare Society of Paris.’ That the meetings take place on the 2d and 4th Fridays of each month, at 8.30 P.M. (For the present, at least, the meetings are held in the rooms of the Church Institute, 106 Faubourg St. Honoré.) That steps be taken to find out the cost of printing a quarterly journal of transactions, before discussing the amount of subscription. That the subjects of study for the present term be the historical plays; that the work of each member be fixed by the organizer elected for that purpose. The first play studied was *King John*. There was an older play, *The Troublesome Raine of King John*, in existence in 1591, which was written by Marlowe, or Peele, or Greene, or somebody else, perhaps Shakespeare. Our play was probably written about 1596. Neither this play nor *Richard II.* has any comedy. Errors and Omissions.—1. No mention is made of Magna Charta, though Langton is introduced. 2. Count Limoges is doubled with the Duke of Austria, who is thus made to kill Richard I. Mr. Viroilleaud criticised the character of the Bastard. Shakespeare seems to have wished to show that in spite of the slur upon his name and birth he was brave, honorable, and above all, patriotic. He is the only good character in the piece. He represents the middle-class feeling of the nation. His soliloquy in

Act I. shows the disdain felt for the upstart aristocracy : " Now I can make any Joan a lady." " New-made honor doth forget men's names." His father's spirit appears in his desire for fighting and in his treatment of Austria. The openness of his mind is shown in the freedom with which he confesses his worship of " Commodity." He is a patriot to the last and ill supports John's abject submission to the Pope and the French. Mr. Kitchener considered the character of Constance, the widowed mother whose son is wronged by his uncle. Mr. Jones drew attention to some parallels between this play and *Macbeth*. In both, a near relation kills the rightful King. The spiritual powers are victorious (the witches and the Roman Church). Both usurpers lose their position through the very means they take to retain it, and both are brought to confusion by a foreign power (*Macbeth* by the English and John by the French). Mr. Maxton remarked that it has been supposed that the play of *King John* contains an undercurrent of allusion to the reign of Elizabeth, in which the rightful heir is Mary Stuart, who is supported by a King of France in the same wavering fashion as Arthur was. The feeling of the nation about the Papal excommunication of the sovereign and the defeat of the foreign invasion, would be well expressed in the jubilant words with which the play closes—

Naught shall make us rue,
If England to itself do rest but true.

THE MELBOURNE SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY has one hundred and thirty-eight regular, eleven honorary members, and a library. It prints annually a list of the papers read during the session, the Shakespeare examination papers during the year, the rules of the Society, and Treasurer's balance-sheet. It institutes prizes for essays, and the names of those to whom they are awarded also appear in these annual reports of proceedings.

Melbourne, Australia. Rev. JOHN REED, Hon. Sec.

MRS. VINCENT'S SHAKESPEARE CLASS, OF AKRON, OHIO, meets at the residence of its President, Mrs. B. T. Vincent, on Satur-

day evenings. The class is at present reading *Lear*, using the Furniss Variorum and the Friendly edition of the play. A spirited debate on the question, "Was Shylock more sinned against than sinning?" was lately a part of the exercises.

Akron, Feb. 13, 1889.

H. S. PHILLIPS, *Secretary*.

MONTREAL SHAKESPEARE CLUB.—21st Meeting.—Essays on *Antony and Cleopatra*. Mr. Stirling commenced with a paper on "Cæsar Augustus" which was mainly historical; the principal points were: His early history; the circumstances leading to the formation of the triumvirate; its history; Cæsar's ambition; his treatment of Antony and Lepidus; his war with Antony; his capture of Cleopatra; the death of Antony and Cleopatra; his good rule after Antony's death; measures taken to please the people, and finally his death in Illyria. The essay concluded with a sketch of his character and of the views taken of him by the historians. The next paper was by Mr. Watson on "Antony." After stating that the interest of the play was more personal than historical, the essayist gave a résumé of the history of Antony; his early life; his advancement by Cæsar; his meeting with Cleopatra, and her influence on his character. His great natural talents were ruined by his passion for pleasure and his lust. Shakespeare has not given us a true picture of Antony, having neglected to show us some of his greatest faults; but the poet has subordinated everything to the love of Antony and Cleopatra. After contrasting their love with the love of Romeo and Juliet—the love of passion and appetite with the love of affection and instinct—the paper closed with an account of his gradual fall and his death. Mr. Bell then read a paper on "Cleopatra." After showing her early life up to the meeting with Antony, the writer described her character and her great personal charms, discussing her infatuation with Antony and their attraction for each other. His love for her was so great that he deserted his wife, while she was willing to do anything to possess him body and soul. A description of her feelings at the death of Antony, and of her own death scene, brought the paper to a close.

F. T. SHORT, *Hon. Sec.*

THE LADIES' SHAKESPEARE CLUB OF CADIZ, OHIO, which has been in existence for fourteen years, held a jubilee on March 29th. A banquet whose menu was elaborately and appropriately garnished with Shakespearian quotations cleverly selected was spread, and the Ladies, the Lawyers, the Doctors, and the Press all appropriately toasted. Miss Lizzie McFadden, the President of the Club, wound up the feast with an eloquent address.

THE LADIES' SHAKESPEARE CLUB OF DECATUR, INDIANA, sends SHAKESPEARIANA its dainty programme of exercises of its seventh anniversary. A "Club Song" pledging its members "All Baconites to eschew" and to Shakespeare "to be true," appears to have held a prominent part in the exercises. The essays read were as follows : Alexander, Achilles—Greek Battles—Agamemnon, Timon, Mrs. M. Bailey ; Pericles, Ajax, Maggie Dorwin ; Priam, Aristides, Athens, Mrs. D. Studabaker ; Priam's Sons, Greek Costumes, Themistocles, Philip of Macedon, Hattie Studabaker ; Siege of Troy, Appomantus, Ancient Greece, Mrs. C. E. Hooper ; Miltiades Ventidius, Ida Mann ; Greek Mythology, Alcibiades, Æschylus : Three Greek Poets, Mrs. Nachtrieb ; Xenophon, Herodotus, Flavius, Mrs. A. Stoops ; Socrates, The Women of Troilus and Cressida, Mrs. N. H. Mann ; Lucius and Lucullus, Mrs. Dick Morrison.

THE SHAKESPEARIAN SECTION OF THE UNITY CLUB of Sioux City, Iowa, held on January 26 its first meeting in the parlors of the Unitarian church, and completed the reading of *King Lear*. A paper was read by Mrs. G. W. Oberholtzer on a "Comparison of the Plays of *Hamlet* and *King Lear*." At the next meeting of the Shakespeare Section the Club will commence the reading of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and the Leader will give a short introductory address to the reading of the play.

WILL Clubs please send SHAKESPEARIANA lists of their officers?

BOOKS RECEIVED.

. Editions of Shakespeare sent to us are reviewed in leading articles under the title, "WHAT EDITION OF SHAKESPEARE SHALL I BUY?" Other volumes are noticed in numerical order on their receipt.

(25) THE SHAKESPEARIAN MYTH. By Appleton Morgan. Third Edition. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. Cloth, pp. 342, xviii.

(26) THE MERMAID SERIES. Edited by Havelock Ellis. John Ford. Edited by Havelock Ellis. London: Vizetelly & Co. Cloth, pp. 401.

(27) THE MERMAID SERIES. Edited by Havelock Ellis. Thomas Otway. Edited by the Hon. Roden Noel. London: Vizetelly & Co. Cloth, pp. 391.

(28) THE MERMAID SERIES. Phillip Massinger. Edited by Arthur Symonds. London: Vizetelly & Co. Cloth, pp. 390-384.

(29) SHAKESPEAREAN EXTRACTS FROM EDWARD PUDSEY'S BOOKE. Temp. Q. Elizabeth and K. James I., which Include some from an unknown Play by William Shakespeare. Also a few unpublished Records of the Shakespeares of Snitterfield and Wroxall. Preserved in the Public Record Office. Edited by Richard Savage. Stratford-on-Avon: John Smith. London: Simpkin & Marshall. Vellum cloth, pp. 83.

(30) THE BANKSIDE SHAKESPEARE. Vol. IV., Troilus and Cressida. New York. The Shakespeare Society of New York, pp. 237.

(31) THE MEMORIAL THEATRE EDITION. First Part of King Henry VI. An Historical Play by William Shakespeare. Edited by C. E. Flower. London: Samuel French, 89 Strand. Paper, pp. 77.

(32) SHAKESPEARE UND SHAKSPERE: Zur Genesis der Shakespeare-Dramen: von K. F. Graf von Vitzthum von Eckstadt. Stuttgart: Verlag der J. G. Cotta'schen. Buchhandlung. Cloth, 8vo, pp. 264.

(33) AN EXPLANATORY AND PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY OF THE NOTED NAMES OF FICTION: Including also the familiar Pseudonyms, Surnames bestowed on eminent men, and analogous

Popular Appellations, often referred to in Literature and Conversation. By William A. Wheeler. Nineteenth edition, with appendix by Charles G. Wheeler. Boston and New York : Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Cloth, pp. 440.

(34) ENGLISH MEN OF ACTION SERIES. Henry the Fifth. By Rev. J. A. Church. London and New York : Macmillan & Co. Cloth, pp. 155.

(35) SIR ANTHONY SHERLEY THE AUTHOR OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS. By Scott Surtees. London : Henry Gray. Cloth, pp. 42.

(36) SHAKESPEARE'S PROVINCIALISMS. Words used in Sussex. By Scott Surtees. Densdale-on-Tees. Paper, pp. 8.